

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/521,084		DRABEZUK, NICOLAS	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Eron J. Sorrell		2182	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Eron J. Sorrell. (3) Ruchi Walia (Reg. No. 59,127).
 (2) Jonathan Osha (Reg. No. 33,986). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10/15/07.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 8-10.

Identification of prior art discussed: US Pub. No. 2002/0178316 to Schmisser.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant pointed out distinctions between the current claims and the applied prior art, specifically Schmisser. The applicant argued that the claims require the auxiliary device hiding functions which the host is not arranged to handle during a second enumeration, whereas Schmisser teaches concealing functions during a second enumeration, however Schmisser does not teach the concealing is based upon that the main device is arranged to handle. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the claim rejections upon the filing of a formal reply.